DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 194 105 IR 008 984

AUTHOR	Ellison, John: And Others
TITLE	Satisfaction of ESEA Title IV-B Administration in Indiana Public and Non-Public Schools.
INSTITUTION	State Univ. of New York, Buffalo. School of Information and Library Studies.
SPONS AGENCY	Indiana State Dept. of Public Instruction, Indianapolis.
PUB DATE	80
NOTE	88p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Comparative Analysis; Federal Programs; *Participant Satisfaction; Private Schools; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Public Schools; Questionnaires; School Surveys; *State School District Relationship; Statistical Analysis
IDENTIFIERS	*Elementary Secondary Education Act Title IV; *Indiana Dept Public Instruction Div Inst Media

ABSTRACT

A study comparing the degree of satisfaction with the Indiana Division of Instructional Media's administration of the ESEA Title IV-B program during the 1979-80 school year reveals that both the public and nonpublic school systems showed a high level of satisfaction with the division's IV-B activities. Two separate questionnaires were designed and submitted to all 306 Indiana public and 326 nonpublic schools. Eighty percent of the public schools responded to the questionnaire, as opposed to 53 percent of the nonpublic schools. The completed questionnaires revealed that the public schools in particular showed strong positive satisfaction with the division's IV-B activities. Nonpublic school responses were positive, but the total number of responses limited interpretation to statistical findings. From the survey, there is no indication that major changes are required in the division's IV-B activities; however, it is suggested that consideration be given to making some minor adjustments or re-directions in activities currently taking place as part of the administrative function of the statewide program. (LLS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED194105

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SATISFACTION OF ESEA TITLE IV-B ADMINISTRATION IN INDIANA PUBLIC AND NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS

"Final Draft"

Dr. John Ellison
President
Institute For Information Associates
and
Associate Professor

Dr. Edward T. O'Neill
Dean
Case Western Reserve University

Dr. Rao Aluri
Assistant Professor
Emory University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

John W. Ellison

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

School of Information and Library Studies
State University of New York at Buffalo

1979-1980

IR008984

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

Introduction 1

Literature Study 2

The Problem (Hypotheses) 3

Methodology 4

Questionnaires 6

Analysis 7
- Public Schools 10
- Non-Public Schools 16
- Open-Ended Questions 16
- Demographic vs. Quantitative 21

Recommendation (Public Schools) 22

Recommendations (Non-Public Schools) 22

Conclusions 24

References 25

Appendix I (Public and Non-Public School Responses)

Appendix II (Public School Questionnaire)

Appendix III (Non-Public School Questionnaire)

Appendix IV (Public School Responses To The Open-Ended Questions)

Appendix V (Non-Public School Responses To The Open-Ended Question)

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to determine the quality (satisfaction) of the Indiana Division of Instructional Media's administration of ESEA Title IV-B in public and non-public schools for the 1979-80 school year. It was designed to examine all IV-B activities carried out by the Division. Specifically, the study examined the qualitative judgements and quantitative information of schools who participated in ESEA Title IV-B by group and then compared the responses of the two groups.

Every effort was taken to keep this study independent of the Indiana Division of Instructional Media and free from bias which could alter the results. All responses were recorded as they were received unless otherwise noted. Participants were guaranteed total anonymity.

Literature Study

Only three studies were identified that examined the satisfaction of schools toward the administration of ESEA Title IV-B programs. Two, McMillan and Morehouse (1978) and Division of Planning and Development (1977), were conducted in Minnesota and the Southwest Research Associates study was conducted in New Mexico (1978).

The Minnesota Division of Planning and Development study, "was designed to gather qualitative judgements from local district personnel relative to the process and impact of Title IV, Part B funding for F.Y. 77."[p.1] Only public schools (375) participated in this study. The combined responses to the two highest categories on the five point Likert-type scale yielded a range from eighty-three percent to ninety-seven percent. Statistical tests were conducted to determine the extent to which responses to six process items (qualitative questions) were consistent across district sizes. It was concluded that small districts appeared to be less well served by the regional meetings than are the medium and large districts and that the single application is a special problem for large districts but not for districts in the other size classifications.[p.6] Four open-ended impact questions were also asked. It was concluded that "local district personnel of major aspects of Title IV, Part B process were generally highly favorable."[p. 24]

The 1978 McMillan and Morehouse study gathered both qualitative judgements and quantitative information regarding the Administration of IV-B. Only public schools (337) participated in this study. Questions regarding the impact of Title IV-B on the academic program were

also included. Conclusions were based on the percentage of responses to four and five point scales. Eight qualitative questions were related directly to the administration of the IV-B program by the State Department of Education. Combined responses to the two highest categories across a four point Likert-type scale yielded a range from eighty-five to ninety-eight percent. It was concluded that local district staff perceptions of the overall Title IV-B process was highly favorable.

The 1978 Southwest Research Associates were involved in a number of process evaluation activities such as meetings, observations, interviews, reading documents and evaluation to determine how successfully the State Department ESEA Title IV personnel and local district personnel accomplished their objectives. Specific objectives identified in New Mexico's Title IV-B Annual Program Plan were used to determine what activities had been completed. Personnel from eleven school districts were interviewed and a summary of responses were reported. It was concluded that all but one of the activities outlined in the New Mexico IV-B Annual Program Plan had been completed.[p.26]

All three studies requested the identification of individual school districts in their survey instruments. Only the Minnesota Division of Planning and Development Study used a test of significance. None of the studies solicited non-public school responses.

The Problem (Hypotheses)

The purpose of this study was to determine the quality (satisfaction) of the Indiana Division of Instructional Media's administration

of ESEA Title IV-B in public and non-public schools and make specific recommendations to improve the program's administration and activities if weaknesses or faults were found. Fourteen qualitative dependent variables and eleven independent variables were used in the public school questionnaire (see Appendix IV). Ten qualitative dependent variables and eleven independent variables were used in the non-public school questionnaire (see Appendix IV). Ten qualitative dependent variables were basically the same for both public and non-public schools. Four dependent variables were unique to public schools. The eleven independent variables in both public and non-public schools were nearly identical with a few minor details. For example, the questions on school enrollment asked for the same information except fewer options were given to non-public schools since it was determined that no Indiana non-public school exceeded 3,000 students.

Each dependent variable was tested against each independent variable in both questionnaires and the demographic questions were tested against the quantitative questions.

Had each of the hypotheses been written, they would have read:

> There is no relationship between administrative positions (question 1) and the importance of the Division of Instructional Media IV-B services you use (question 10). (Null Hypothesis)

Methodology

Two separate questionnaires were designed and submitted to all 306 Indiana public and 326 non-public schools. All questionnaires were mailed on December 12, 1979. Responses were to be returned by January

11, 1980. Follow-up letters were not mailed to solicit additional responses after the January 11, 1980 deadline.

All mailings to public school personnel were directed to the "ESEA IV-B Contact Person." Non-public school mailings were directed to the "Principal." The Indiana Division of Instructional Media has traditionally used these titles for all ESEA IV-B mailings. Mailing labels were furnished by the Indiana Department of Public Instruction.

Two letters were enclosed with each questionnaire (see Appendices II & III). One was from the Director of the Indiana Division of Instructional Media. The second was from the primary investigator. Total anonymity was guaranteed.

Data collected were coded for examination by computer. The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) was used. Each independent variable was analyzed separately with each dependent variable in both public and non-public school questionnaires. A cross-tabulation was made, taking both public and non-public schools and comparing identical questions. All computer analyses were completed April 4, 1980.

Eleven quantitative/demographic independent and fourteen qualitative dependent variables were measured for interaction in the public school questionnaire. A Chi-square test was chosen to measure significance at the .05 level.

Non-public schools had eleven quantitative/demographic independent and ten qualitative dependent variables which were measured for interaction. Again, a Chi-square was chosen to measure significance at the .05 level.

Data collected for each independent variable were analyzed

separately with each dependent variable. In other words, each of the public school independent variables were tested against each public school dependent variable. The same process was used with non-public school responses. A total of 274 independent and dependent variable pairs were analyzed. Matched public and non-public school dependent and independent variables were also analyzed to measure significance at the .05 level.

Questionnaires

Two questionnaires were designed to measure each public school and non-public school satisfaction. Both instruments assessed basically the same information. The public school questionnaire asked five questions unique to their particular situation. Question 9 requested satisfaction of Administrative Coordinator of Federal Projects visit, question 11 requested an indication of "basis of funds," question 12c requested satisfaction of handling finances, question 12g requested satisfaction of follow-up letters and question 12i requested the efficiency of approving applications.

The public school questionnaire consisted of twelve quantitative/demographic questions and fourteen qualitative Likert-type scale questions which were designed to measure the schools' satisfaction. Non-public schools were asked eleven quantitative/demographic questions and ten qualitative Likert-type scale questions. One identical open-ended question was asked of both public and non-public schools. Both questionnaires were developed by the primary investigator for purposes of the study.

On October 30 - November 2, 1979 the primary investigator consulted with the Division of Instructional Media in Indianapolis. The first drafts of the two questionnaires were designed at that time. The Division Director, Administrative Coordinator of Federal Projects and Program Consultants were all consulted during the design period. Once the drafts were revised two or three times during this three day period, they were taken to the ESEA Title IV-B Contact Person in the state's largest school corporation, a suburban school corporation and a rural school corporation. Each ESEA Title IV-B Contact Person read the questionnaire drafts for clarity and missing questions vital to the study. Finally, the project statistician reviewed each questionnaire for possible problems at the time of tabulation, programming and analysis.

Analysis

Eighty percent (247) of the 306 public schools responded to the questionnaire, while fifty-three percent (162) of the 306 non-public schools responded. Originally, 326 non-public schools were identified. Twenty responded that they did not participate in ESEA IV-B or their school was no longer in operation. The two Minnesota studies had a similar (eighty-six and seventy-eight percent) response rates to their public school surveys.

Table 1 shows the total responses of the public and non-public schools to the qualitative questions on the questionnaires. Seventy-three percent of the public schools and fifty-five percent of the non-public schools are in the upper two ranks of the Likert-scale while only eight percent of the public schools and fifteen percent of non-

TABLE 1

PUBLIC AND NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL RESPONSES
TO QUALITATIVE QUESTIONS

	Extremely Unsatified				Extremely Satisfied
Likert-scale	1	2	3	4	5
Public School Total Responses	*85 (3%)	160 (5%)	614 (19%)	1230 (39%)	1072 (34%)
Non-Public School Total Responses	**73 (6%)	122 (9%)	394 (30%)	374 (28%)	362 (27%)

*Fourteen qualitative questions were used

**Ten qualitative questions were used

public schools are in the lower two ranks. This summary is a strong indication of general support for the Division.

General interpretation of the fifty-three percent non-public schools' responses should be limited because of the administrative process. The combined eighty-five percent positive responses in the upper three ranks of Table 1 is impressive, but caution should be used when citing these figures. Non-public schools work through their public school counterpart rather than directly with the Division of Instructional Media. Attitudes toward the Division may reflect this working relationship with public schools, and there is no assurance that the fifty-three percent non-public response represents their feeling toward public schools or the Division.

Only four public school qualitative questions received twenty or more responses in the combined lower two ranks of the Likert-scale. Question 10, "In general, how important or worthwhile are the Division of Instructional Media IV-B services you use?" shows ten percent of the respondents in the lower two ranks (see Appendix I Table 10). Seventeen percent of the respondents to the question 12b, "How satisfied are you with the formula based on the criteria established by the federal PL93-380 by which funds are allocated to your school corporation?" (see Appendix I Table 12b) are in the combined lower two ranks. Respodents to question 12h, "How satisfied are you with the regional ESEA IV-B workshops sponsored by the Division?" shows ten percent response on the combined lower two ranks (see Appendix I Table 12h). Finally, question 12k, "How satisfied are you with the non-public school coordination responsibility which is required by ESEA IV-B rules

and regulations?" shows sixteen percent of the respondents in the combined lower ranks of the Likert-scale (see Appendix I, Table 12k).

Five non-public school qualitative questions received twenty or more responses in the combined lower two ranks of the Likert-scale. Question 8, "In general, how important or worthwhile to you are the Division of Instructional Media ESEA IV-B services you use?" shows twenty-one percent of the respondents in the lower two ranks (see Appendix I, Table 10). Thirteen percent of the respondents to question 10a, "How satisfied are you with the information about ESEA IV-B provided by the Division of Instructional Media?" (see Appendix I, Table 12A) were in the lower two ranks. Respondents to question 10b, "How satisfied are you with the basis for distribution of monies to your school?" shows sixteen percent of the respondents in the lower two ranks (see Appendix I, Table 12B). Question 10g, "How satisfied are you with the coordination between your school and the public school corporation?" shows fifteen percent of the respondents in the lower two ranks (see Appendix I, Table 12k). Finally, nineteen percent of the respondents to question 10h, "How satisfied are you with the dates designated when applications are due?" (see Appendix I, Table 12J) are in the combined lower two ranks of the Likert-scale.

Public Schools

Statistically significant differences were found four times when using the Chi-square test between quantitative independent and qualitative dependent variables in the public school questionnaire (see Table 2). The number of years a person administered IV-B and the satisfaction expressed with on-site monitoring by the program consultants

TABLE 2

Significant Differences In Public Schools

QUESTIONS	9. Administrative Coordinator's Visit	10. Importance of Division	12a. Information about IV-B	12b. Formula	12c. Finances	12d. Administrative Manual	12e. 1980 Application	12f. On-Site Monitoring	12g. Follow-up Letters	12h. Regional Workshop	12i. Approving Applications	12j. Dates Due	12k. Coordination Responsibility	12L. Consultant Assistance
1. Position														
2. Years As Administration								25.73 (12)	29.65 (12)		22.73 (12)			
3. Distance from Indianapolis		32.16 (16)												
4. Number of Students														
5. School Contacted the Division														
6. Division Contacted the School														
7. Calls... a. for fiscal														
b. for assistance														
c. on proposal application														
d. on monitoring process														
8. Length of Calls														

from the Division were found significant (see Table 3). It appears that the longer persons administer IV-B the more satisfied they are with the on-site monitoring activities. First year administrators show a fifty percent response in the combined upper two ranks of the Likert-scale while administrators with four years of experience show seventy-eight percent in the same two upper ranks.

Significance was found between the number of years a person administered IV-B and the satisfaction expressed with follow-up letters forwarded by the program consultants after on-site monitoring (see Table 4). It seems that persons who have administered IV-B for a longer period of time are more satisfied with follow-up letters than those who have less experience. The greatest difference appears between first year administrators who show forty-seven percent in the combined upper two ranks and a seventy-two percent response by administrators with four years of experience.

The efficiency of the Division in approving ESEA IV-B applications is found significant with the number of years a person administered the IV-B program (see Table 5). First and second year administrators show a seventy-six and seventy-eight percent response respectively in the upper two combined ranks while third and fourth year administrators show ninety and ninety-one percent in the same two combined ranks. Again, it would appear that administrators with more experience are generally more satisfied than those with less experience.

The distance from Indianapolis of public schools and the IV-B administrators' feelings toward the importance of the Division of Instructional Media ESEA IV-B services was found to be signficant

TABLE 3

PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Number of Years as Administrator (question 2) by Satisfaction with On-Site Monitoring by Consultants (question 12f) TOTAL RESPONSES = 218

YEARS	Extremely Unsatisfied 1	2	3	4	Extremely Satisfied 5
1	1 5.0%	3 15.0%	6 30.0%	5 25.0%	5 25.0%
2	0	0	7 30.4%	14 60.9%	2 8.7%
3	0	2 6.9%	5 17.2%	12 41.4%	10 34.5%
4	4 2.7%	2 1.4%	26 17.8%	59 40.4%	55 37.7%
TOTALS	5 2.3%	7 3.2%	44 20.2%	90 41.3%	72 33.0%

($\chi^2 = 14.57$; df = 6; $p < .05$)

For statistical purposes, columns one, two and three were combined.

TABLE 4

PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Number of Years as Administrator (question 2) by Follow-Up letters forwarded by Consultant (question 12g) TOTAL RESPONSES = 208

YEARS	Extremely Unsatisfied 1	2	3	4	Extremely Satisfied 5
1	1 5.3%	0	9 47.4%	4 21.1%	5 26.3%
2	0	1 4.3%	7 30.4%	14 60.9%	1 4.3%
3	0	5 17.9%	4 14.3%	7 25.0%	12 42.9%
4	3 2.2%	7 5.1%	28 20.3%	52 37.7%	48 34.8%
TOTALS	4 1.9%	13 6.3%	48 23.1%	77 37.0%	66 31.7%

(χ^2 = 16.54; df = 6; p < .05)

For statistical purposes, columns one, two and three were combined.

TABLE 5

PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Number of Years as Administrator (question 2) by Efficiency of Division at Approving IV-B Applications (question 12i) TOTAL RESPONSES = 245

YEARS	Extremely Unsatisfied 1	2	3	4	Extremely Satisfied 5
1	1 4.0%	2 8.0%	3 12.0%	8 32.0%	11 44.0%
2	0	0	6 22.2%	14 51.9%	7 25.9%
3	1 2.9%	1 2.9%	1 2.6%	12 35.3%	19 55.9%
4	3 1.9%	3 1.9%	9 5.7%	51 32.1%	93 58.5%
TOTALS	5 2.0%	6 2.4%	19 7.8%	85 35.7%	130 53.1%

(χ^2 = 14.09; df = 6; p .05)

For statistical purposes, columns one, two and three were combined.

(see Table 6). Public schools between 101-150 miles from Indianapolis show fifty-nine percent in the combined upper two ranks while schools from all other distances show a higher percentage in the same two ranks. This response might indicate that one region of the state within the 101-150 mile range needs more attention from the Division.

Non-Public Schools

Statistical significance was found once when using the chi-square test between quantitative independent and qualitative dependent variables in the non-public school questionnaire (see Table 7).

Table 8 shows the number of times members of the Division of Instructional Media personally contacted (telephone, letters, personal visits, etc.) non-public school IV-B administrators and the importance of the Division's IV-B services. When combining the upper two ranks on the Likert-scale it shows that the more contacts made by the Division the greater positive satisfaction non-public school IV-B administrators have toward the Division. Administrators who were contacted once showed forty-five percent in the combined two upper ranks while those contacted five times showed eighty-seven percent in the same combined ranks. It would appear that the Division would improve its image toward IV-B service by contacting non-public schools more often.

Open-Ended Questions

Each public and non-public school questionnaire had the same open-ended question: "How can the Division of Instructional Media improve on administering the ESEA IV-B program?" Forty-five percent (111) of the public school respondents provided comments in reference to this

TABLE 6

PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Distance from Indianapolis (question 3) by the Importance of the Division's IV-B Services (question 10) TOTAL RESPONSES = 237

DISTANCE	Extremely Helpful 1	Somewhat Helpful 2	Helpful 3	Slightly Helpful 4	Not Helpful 5
0-50 MILES	25 44.6%	10 17.9%	15 26.8%	3 5.4%	3 5.4%
51-100 MILES	55 69.6%	9 11.4%	10 12.7%	4 5.1%	1 1.3%
101-150 MILES	23 32.9%	18 25.7%	18 25.7%	8 11.4%	3 4.3%
151-200 MILES	15 60.0%	2 8.0%	6 24.0%	1 4.0%	1 4.0%
201-250 MILES	7 100.0%	0	0	0	0
TOTALS	125 52.7%	39 16.5%	49 20.7%	16 6.8%	8 3.4%

($\chi^2 = 26.89$; df = 9; $p < .05$)

For statistical purposes, columns four and five were combined.

TABLE 7

Siginficant Differences In Non-Public Schools

QUESTIONS	9. Importance of Division	10a. Information on ESEA IV-B	10b. Distribution of Monies	10c. Administrative Manual	10d. Consultant Assistance	10e. On-Site Monitoring	10f. Regional Workshops	10g. Coordination	10h. Application Dates	10i. 1980 Application
1. Position										
2. Years As Administrator										
3. Distance from Indianapolis										
4. Number of Students										
5. School Contacted the Division										
6. Division Contacted the School	28.20 (16)									
7. Calls... a. for information b. for assistance c. on proposal application d. on monitoring process										
8. Length of Calls										

TABLE 8

NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Number of Times the Division contacted you (question 6) by Importance of the Division's IV-B Services (question 9) TOTAL RESPONSES = 91

TIMES	Extremely Important 1	Somewhat Important 2	Important 3	Slightly Important 4	Not Very Important 5
1	5 15.1%	9 29.0%	9 29.0%	3 9.7%	5 16.1%
2	6 35.3%	3 17.6%	6 35.3%	1 5.9%	1 5.9%
3	9 56.3%	3 18.8%	4 25.0%	0	0
4	10 83.3%	0	1 8.3%	1 8.3%	0
5	8 53.3%	5 33.3%	1 6.7%	0	1 6.7%
TOTALS	38 41.8%	20 22.0%	21 23.1%	5 5.5%	21 15.0%

($\chi^2 = 11.76$; df = 4; $p < .05$)

For statistical purposes, columns one and two were combined and columns three, four and five were combined.

question (see Appendix IV). Forty-one schools made suggestions on how they would improve the administration of IV-B. The largest number of respondents (ten) suggested that the formula used to determine allocations be clarified or changed. Comments like, "work to adjust formula/ allocation of funds," "Improve the formula...," and "The funding formula should be more equitable..." is a strong indication that some problems exist in this area. Four respondents felt a single application should be acceptable from each school corporation. Three respondents felt the application form should be updated. Other suggestions that received two comments each included sample applications, more program writing meetings, the September 30 date, providing funds earlier, installing a Watts or 800 line, eliminating the program aspect from the proposal and providing samples of outstanding program applications.

All of the public school comments were positive statements or neutral suggestions except for one negative comment. The positive statements that were combined with suggestions totaled one hundred and four or ninety-four percent.

Sixty-four percent (103) of the non-public school respondents provided comments in reference to this question (see Appendix V). Ninety-three or eighty-five percent of the non-public school comments were positive statements or suggestions which they felt would improve the Division or their cooperation with their local public school.

Fifteen of the non-public schools indicated some dissatisfaction with the notification dates and deadlines. There appears to be a problem between the time public schools receive the applications and the time non-public schools are asked to submit information and applications.

This problem seems to exist between the public and non-public schools rather than the Division. Ten non-public schools indicated some dissatisfaction with the formula used to allocate funds. It appears in some cases they have no idea how the allocation is determined. Other suggestions that received four comments each included less paperwork, better cooperation with public schools, poor communication and the need for more information about IV-B. It is important to note that non-public schools are not as likely to be in direct contact with the Division since their IV-B contact is with the local public school district. Some comments seem to refer to the Division when they may be more likely discussing the public school corporation.

The higher rate of respondents who took time to comment, forty-five percent public school and sixty-four percent non-public school, is a strong indication that more than tacit support for the Division's administrative activities exists in the public and non-public schools. Some respondents made specific suggestions which should be given consideration, but in each case one should compare the comment with the appropriate frequency table in Appendix I which addresses that specific comment. This process will give a better picture of all respondents' feelings regarding an administrative activity rather than one or two isolated written comments. Likewise, comments should not be totally rejected if they fall in the minority. Some may provide insights which have not been considered in the past.

Demographic vs. Quantitative

Statistical significances were found once when using the chi-

square test between demographic and quantitative question on both the public and non-public school questionnaires. The position of the public school IV-B contact person is significant with the number of times a member of the Division was in contact with the IV-B contact person the past year (see Table 9). Eighty-three percent of the total number of respondents (247) were contacted by the Division during the past year. It appears that IV-B contact persons in positions of superintendent are contacted more often than IV-B contact persons in assistant superintendent, principal, librarian, federal project director or other positions. Thirty percent of the Superintendents were contacted four or five times while federal project directors were contacted four or five times twenty percent of the time. These responses may be accounted for because most of the contacts after mailings are by telephone and superintendents and federal project directors are likely to always be near a telephone.

Recommendations (Public Schools)

- Provide special assistance to public school IV-B administrators with particular attention given to those in their first year.
- Work to improve the image of the Division in public schools in regions where there is an identified need.
- Make sure information provided by the Division on IV-B is understood by all public school IV-B contact persons.
- Encourage public school IV-B administrators to inform non-public schools of IV-B activities as early as possible each school year.

Recommendations (Non-Public Schools)

- Hold regional workshop for non-public schools which show a need.
- Provide special assistance by telephone or in person for first year contact persons in non-public schools.

TABLE 9

PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Position of the IV-B Contact Person (question 1) by the Number of Times Members of the Division was in contact with the IV-B Contact Person the Past Year (question 6) TOTAL RESPONSES = 204

Position	TIMES CONTACTED 1	2	3	4	5
Superintendent	12 36.4%	9 27.3%	2 6.1%	3 9.1%	7 21.2%
Assistant Superintendent	21 31.8%	22 33.3%	10 15.2%	6 9.1%	7 10.6%
Principal	16 61.5%	2 7.7%	5 19.2%	0	3 11.5%
Librarian	17 37.8%	10 22.2%	11 24.4%	2 4.4%	5 11.1%
Federal Project Director	4 21.1%	10 52.6%	1 5.3%	3 15.8%	1 5.3%
Other	4 26.7%	3 20.0%	7 46.7%	1 6.7%	0
TOTALS	74 36.3%	56 27.5%	36 17.6%	15 7.4%	23 11.3%

($\chi^2 = 21.19$; df = 12 ; $p < .05$)

For statistical purposes, all responses five and over were reported as four.

- Make sure all non-public school contact persons in their first year receive IV-B information.

Conclusions

The results of this study provide a strong indication that the Division of Instructional Media is doing an outstanding job administering the ESEA Title IV-B program in Indiana. Public Schools in particular show strong positive satisfaction overall for the Division's IV-B activities. Non-public school responses were positive, but the total number of responses limited the interpretation to statistical findings. Combined public and non-public school responses show a high level of satisfaction in every Division IV-B activity as measured on a qualitative scale.

From the survey, there is no indication that major changes are required in the Division's IV-B activities. Immediate consideration should be given to the Recommendations section of this report, but none of the recommendations should be considered more than minor adjustments or redirection of activities currently taking place as part of the administrative function of the Indiana IV-B program.

References

Minnesota State Department of Education. Division of Planning and Development. A Survey of Local District Perceptions Regarding The Implementation and Impact of Title IV, PART B Within Minnesota. St. Paul, 1977.

McMillan, W.B. and Morehouse, D.L., A Survey of Local District Perceptions Regarding The Implementation and Impact of Title IV, PART B in Minnesota Fiscal Year 1978. St. Paul, 1978.

Southwest Research Associates. Final Evaluation Report in ESEA Title IV Administration of Part B and Administration of Part C-1. Albuquerque, 1978.

APPENDIX I

TABLE 1

What is your position?	PUBLIC RESPONSES	PUBLIC PERCENTAGES	NON-PUBLIC RESPONSES	NON-PUBLIC PERCENTAGE
Superintendent	43	17.6	4	2.5
Assistant Superintendent	71	29.1		
Principal	31	12.7	136	84.5
Librarian	57	23.4	21	13.0
Federal Project Director	21	8.6		
Other	21	8.6		
TOTAL	224		161	

($X^2 = 220.23$; df = 5; $p < .05$)

Chi-square was calculated with missing values.

TABLE 2

How many years have you personally administered the ESEA IV-B Program?	PUBLIC		NON-PUBLIC	
	RESPONSES	PERCENTAGES	RESPONSES	PERCENTAGES
YEARS				
0	2	.8	4	2.6
1	20	8.3	18	11.5
2	27	11.2	28	17.9
3	34	14.0	22	14.1
4	159	65.7	84	53.8
TOTAL	242		156	

($\chi^2 = 8.45$; df = 3; p .05)

TABLE 3

Approximately how far is your school from Indianapolis?	PUBLIC		NON-PUBLIC	
	RESPONSES	PERCENTAGES	RESPONSES	PERCENTAGES
0-50 MILES	57	23.3	38	24.7
51-100 MILES	83	33.9	18	11.7
101-150 MILES	73	29.8	57	37.0
151-200 MILES	25	10.2	27	17.5
201-250 MILES	7	2.9	14	9.1
TOTAL	245		154	

($\chi^2 = 30.86$; $df = 4$; $p < .05$)

TABLE 4

How many students are currently enrolled in your school?	PUBLIC		NON-PUBLIC	
	RESPONSES	PERCENTAGES	RESPONSES	PERCENTAG
0-500 STUDENTS	9	3.7	140	87.0
501-1500 STUDENTS	67	27.3	20	12.4
1501-3000 STUDENTS	86	35.1	1	.6
3001-6000 STUDENTS	51	20.8		
6001-12000 STUDENTS	21	8.6		
12000-24000 STUDENTS	6	2.4		
24000-48000 STUDENTS	4	1.6		
ABOVE 48000 STUDENTS	1	.4		
TOTAL	245		161	

($\chi^2 = 302.16$; df = 7; $p < .05$)

TABLE 5

How many times have you personally contacted (telephone, letters, personal visits, etc.) a member of the Division of Instructional Media regarding ESEA IV-B during the past year?

TIMES	PUBLIC		NON-PUBLIC	
	RESPONSES	PERCENTAGES	RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE
0	28	11.5	87	56.9
1	36	14.8	14	9.2
2	59	24.3		15.0
3	49	20.2	12	7.8
4	23	9.5	8	5.2
5	12	4.9	5	3.3
6	16	6.6	1	.7
7	4	1.6		
8	4	1.6	1	.7
9	1	.4		
10	4	1.6	1	.7
12	2	.8		
15	1	.4		
20	1	.4		
25	2	.8	1	.7
30	1	.4		
TOTAL	243		153	

For statistical purposes, all responses six and over were reported as five.

TABLE 6

How many times have members of the Division of Instructional Media - ESEA IV-B, personally been in contact with you during the past year?

TIMES	PUBLIC		NON-PUBLIC	
	RESPONSES	PERCENTAGES	RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE
0	35	14.6	59	38.3
1	74	31.0	32	20.8
2	56	23.4	19	12.3
3	36	15.1	16	10.4
4	15	6.3	12	7.8
5	5	2.1	8	5.2
6	7	2.9	3	1.9
7	1	.4	1	.6
8			1	.6
9	2	.8		
10	4	1.7	1	.6
11	1	.4		
12			1	.6
15	1	.4		
20	1	.4	1	.6
25	1	.4		
TOTAL	239		154	

For statistical purposes, all responses six and over were reported as five.

TABLE 7A

When you call the Division of Instructional Media - ESEA IV-B, how often do you call...

a. to ask for information about ESEA IV-B fiscal matters?	PUBLIC		NON-PUBLIC	
	RESPONSES	PERCENTAGES	RESPONSES	PERCENTAGES
TIMES				
0	33	19.9	48	62.3
1	77	46.4	21	26.0
2	36	21.7	8	10.4
3	12	7.2	1	1.3
4	3	1.8		
5	2	1.2		
6	2	1.2		
8	1	.6		
TOTAL	166		77	

For statistical purposes, all responses four and over were reported as three.

TABLE 7B

When you call the Division of Instructional Media - ESEA IV-B, how often do you call...

b. to ask for assistance in preparation of your ESEA IV-B proposal?	PUBLIC		NON-PUBLIC	
	RESPONSES	PERCENTAGES	RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE
TIMES				
0	43	26.9	41	43.6
1	71	44.4	27	28.7
2	30	18.8	20	21.3
3	10	6.3	4	4.3
4	3	1.9		
5	1	.6	2	2.1
10	1	.6		
16	1	.6		
TOTAL	160		94	

For statistical purposes, all responses four and over were reported as three.

TABLE 7C

When you call the Division of Instructional Media - ESEA IV-B, how often do you call...

c. to clarify questions regarding the proposal application?	PUBLIC		NON-PUBLIC	
	RESPONSES	PERCENTAGES	RESPONSES	PERCENTAGES
TIMES				
0	29	16.4	41	46.6
1	90	50.8	22	25.0
2	40	22.6	17	19.3
3	10	5.6	5	5.7
4	4	2.3		
5	1	.6	2	2.3
6			1	1.1
7	1	.6		
10	1	.6		
18	1	.6		
TOTAL	177		88	

For statistical purposes, all responses four and over were reported as three.

TABLE 7D

When you call the Division of Instructional Media - ESEA IV-B, how often do you call...

d. to ask for information about the ESEA IV-B program monitoring process?	PUBLIC		NON-PUBLIC	
	RESPONSES	PERCENTAGES	RESPONSES	PERCENTAGES
TIMES				
0	57	58.8	52	88.1
1	28	28.9	6	10.2
2	9	9.3	1	1.7
3	3	3.1		
TOTAL	97		59	

TABLE 8

When you call the Division of Instructional Media - ESEA IV-B, about how many minutes do you usually spend on the telephone?

MINUTES	PUBLIC		NON-PUBLIC	
	RESPONSES	PERCENTAGES	RESPONSES	PERCENTAGES
0	5	2.2	26	27.4
1	1	.4	1	1.1
2	14	6.1	4	4.2
3	54	23.7	7	7.4
4	26	11.4	7	7.4
5	74	32.5	22	23.2
6	3	1.3	2	2.1
7	4	1.8	3	3.2
8	18	7.9	8	8.4
10	22	9.6	8	8.4
13	2	.9	1	1.1
15	3	1.3	5	5.3
18	1	.4		
20	1	.4		
25			1	1.1
TOTAL	228		95	

($\chi^2 = 66.09$; df = 14; $p < .05$)

For statistical purposes, all responses eleven and over were reported as ten.

TABLE 9

*During the past two years, the Administrative Coordinator of Federal Projects for the Division of Instructional Media visited the person responsible for financial records of your ESEA IV-B project. Please contact your financial records person and ask if the visit was...

	PUBLIC	
	RESPONSES	PERCENTAGES
Extremely Helpful	49	22.0
Somewhat Helpful	57	25.6
Helpful	89	39.9
Slightly Helpful	20	9.0
Not Helpful	8	3.6
TOTAL	223	

*This question was only asked on the public school questionnaire.

TABLE 10

In general, how important or worthwhile are the Division of Instructional Media - ESEA IV-B services you use?

	PUBLIC		NON-PUBLIC	
	RESPONSES	PERCENTAGES	RESPONSES	PERCENTAGES
Extremely Important	126	52.7	52	35.4
Somewhat Important	39	16.3	35	23.8
Important	50	20.9	29	19.7
Slightly Important	16	6.7	10	6.8
Not Very Important	8	3.3	21	14.3
TOTAL	239		147	

($\chi^2 = 23.13$; $df = 4$; $p < .05$)

TABLE 11

PUBLIC

*Your school corporation has received ESEA IV-B funds on the basis of?

RESPONSES = 247	1976	1977	1978	1979
a. Enrollment	199 (81%)	200 (81%)	210 (85%)	212 (86%)
b. High Cost Pupils (compensatory, sparsity, institutionalized)	91 (37%)	95 (38%)	99 (40%)	104 (42%)
c. High Tax Rate/Below Average Expenditure	17 (7%)	17 (7%)	22 (9%)	17 (7%)

*This question was only asked on the public school questionnaire.

TABLE 12A

How satisfied are you with the...

a. information about ESEA IV-B provided by the Division of Instructional Media?	PUBLIC		NON-PUBLIC	
	RESPONSES	PERCENTAGES	RESPONSES	PERCENTAGES
Extremely Unsatisfied	4	1.6	4	2.5
	5	2.0	16	10.1
	42	17.1	53	33.5
	107	43.7	50	31.6
Extremely Satisfied	87	35.5	35	22.2
TOTAL	245		158	

($\chi^2 = 32.63$; df = 4; $p < .05$)

TABLE 12B

How satisfied are you with the...

	PUBLIC		NON-PUBLIC	
b. formula based on the criteria established by the federal law PL93-380 by which funds are allocated to your school corporation?	RESPONSES	PERCENTAGES	b. basis for distribution o monies to your school? RESPONSES	PERCENTAGES
Extremely Unsatisfied	15	6.4	12	7.6
	24	10.3	13	8.3
	60	25.8	50	31.8
	95	40.8	47	29.9
Extremely Satisfied	39	16.7	35	22.3
TOTAL	233		157	

TABLE 12C

*How satisfied are you with the...

c. efficiency the Division handles your ESEA IV-B's finances?

	PUBLIC	
	RESPONSES	PERCENTAGES
Extremely Unsatisfied	5	2.1
	5	2.1
	15	6.2
	109	45.0
Extremely Satisfied	108	44.6
TOTAL	242	

*This question was only asked on the public school questionnaire.

TABLE 12D

How satisfied are you with the...

d. Administrative Manual and Guidelines provided by the Division?	PUBLIC		NON-PUBLIC	
	RESPONSES	PERCENTAGES	RESPONSES	PERCENTAGES
Extremely Unsatisfied	5	2.1	3	2.0
	7	2.9	10	6.8
	35	14.5	50	33.8
	111	45.9	45	30.4
Extremely Satisfied	84	34.7	40	27.0
TOTAL	242		148	

($X^2 = 26.07$; $df = 4$; $p < .05$)

TABLE 12E

How satisfied are you with the...

e. current information requested on the fiscal 1980 application form?	PUBLIC		NON-PUBLIC	
	RESPONSES	PERCENTAGES	RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE
Extremely Unsatisfied	1	.4	2	1.4
	10	4.1	9	6.4
	50	20.7	58	41.1
	115	47.5	48	34.0
Extremely Satisfied	59	24.4	24	17.0
Not Applicable	7	2.9		
TOTAL	242		141	

($X^2 = 21.09$; $df = 4$; $p < .05$)

Chi-square value was calculated after removing "Not Applicable" responses.

TABLE 12F

How satisfied are you with the...

f. with on-site monitoring conducted by a program consultant from the Division?	PUBLIC		NON-PUBLIC	
	RESPONSES	PERCENTAGES	RESPONSES	PERCENTAG
Extremely Unsatisfied	5	2.1	4	2.7
	7	2.9	11	7.3
	44	18.1	31	20.7
	90	37.0	20	13.3
Extremely Satisfied	72	29.6	8	5.3
Not Applicable	25	10.3	76	50.7
TOTAL	243		150	

($\chi^2 = 36.97$; df = 4; $p < .05$)

Chi-square value was calculated after removing "Not Applicable" responses.

TABLE 12G

*How satisfied are you with the...

g. follow-up letters forwarded by the program consultant after the on-site monitoring?	PUBLIC	
	RESPONSES	PERCENTAGES
Extremely Unsatisfied	4	1.7
	13	5.4
	48	19.8
	77	31.8
Extremely Satisfied	66	27.3
Not Applicable	34	14.0
TOTAL	242	

*This question was only asked on the public school questionnaire.

TABLE 12H

How satisfied are you with the...

h. regional ESEA IV-B workshops sponsored by the Division?	PUBLIC		NON-PUBLIC	
	RESPONSES	PERCENTAGES	RESPONSES	PERCENTAGES
Extremely Unsatisfied	7	2.9	3	2.1
	17	7.1	9	6.3
	63	26.4	31	21.7
	74	31.0	19	13.3
Extremely Satisfied	38	15.9	16	11.2
Not Applicable	40	16.7	65	45.5
TOTAL	239		143	

Chi-square value was calculated after removing "Not Applicable" responses.

TABLE 12I

*How satisfied are you with the...

i. efficiency of the Division at approving ESEA IV-B applications?	PUBLIC	
	RESPONSES	PERCENTAGES
Extremely Unsatisfied	5	2.0
	6	2.4
	19	7.8
	85	34.7
Extremely Satisfied	130	53.1
TOTAL	245	

*This question was only asked on the public school questionnaire.

TABLE 12J

How satisfied are you with the...

j. dates designated when applications are due?	PUBLIC		NON-PUBLIC	
	RESPONSES	PERCENTAGES	RESPONSES	PERCENTAGES
Extremely Unsatisfied	5	2.1	9	5.8
	7	2.9	21	13.6
	30	12.4	38	24.7
	95	39.4	47	29.9
Extremely Satisfied	104	43.2	40	26.0
TOTAL	241		154	

($X^2 = 37.19$; df =4; $p < .05$)

TABLE 12K

How satisfied are you with the...

	PUBLIC		NON-PUBLIC	
k. non-public school coordination responsibility which is required by ESEA IV-B rules and regulation?	RESPONSES	PERCENTAGES	k. coordination between your school and the public scho corporation? RESPONSES	PERCENTAGES
Extremely Unsatisfied	10	6.5	10	6.3
	15	9.7	14	8.8
	44	28.4	22	13.7
	60	38.7	31	18.8
Extremely Satisfied	26	16.8	84	52.5
TOTAL	155		160	

($\chi^2 = 47.88$; df = 4; $p < .05$)

TABLE 12L

How satisfied are you with the...

	PUBLIC		NON-PUBLIC	
1. assistance provided by the program consultant from the Division?	RESPONSE	PERCENTAGES	1. technical assistance provided by the program consultants from the Division? RESPONSES	PERCENTAGES
Extremely Unsatisfied	3	1.3	5	3.2
	7	3.0	9	5.8
	25	10.6	31	20.0
	116	49.4	28	18.1
Extremely Satisfied	84	35.7	27	17.4
Not Applicable			55	35.5
TOTAL	235		155	

($\chi^2 = 35.86$; df = 4; $p < .05$)

Chi-square value was calculated after removing "Not Applicable" responses.

APPENDIX II

State University of New York at Buffalo

SCHOOL OF INFORMATION AND LIBRARY STUDIES

Indiana Public School Survey
December 7, 1979

Dear ESEA IV-B Contact Person:

The purpose of this study is to determine the quality of service provided by the Division of Instructional Media - ESEA IV-B, Indiana Department of Public Instruction as viewed by YOU. Responses obtained from each school corporation will be treated as confidential and individual identity is not solicited and will not be recorded. Total anonymity is guaranteed. The data obtained will be used in a highly professional manner to further the causes of education, and with the idea in mind of assisting your school corporation.

YOUR PERSONAL FEELINGS AS THEY RELATE TO THE TIME YOU HAVE ADMINISTERED THE ESEA IV-B PROGRAM IS THE ONLY CONCERN OF THIS STUDY UNLESS OTHERWISE INDICATED IN A SPECIFIC QUESTION. Please take a few minutes to record your personal feelings and return the survey by January 11, 1980. Follow-up letters will not be mailed to solicit responses not received after January 11, 1980.

Again, this survey is not intended to evaluate any division, department or activity other than the Division of Instructional Media - ESEA IV-B. Your cooperation is most sincerely appreciated.

Cordially,

John W. Ellison
Assoicate Professor

/rm
Enc.

LAWRENCE D. BELL HALL BUFFALO, NEW YORK 14260 TEL. (716) 636-2412

1. What is your position?

Superintendent	_____
Assistant Superintendent	_____
Principal	_____
Librarian	_____
Federal Project Director	_____
Other	_____

2. How many years have you personally administered the ESEA IV-B Program?

_____years

3. Approximately how far is your school corporation from Indianapolis?

0-50 miles	_____	
51-100 miles	_____	
101-150 miles	_____	(check one)
151-200 miles	_____	
201-250 miles	_____	

4. How many students are currently enrolled in your public school corporation?

0-500 students	_____	
501-1,500 students	_____	
1,501-3,000 students	_____	
3,001-6,000 students	_____	(check one)
6,001-12,000 students	_____	
12,001-24,000 students	_____	
24,001-48,000 students	_____	
Above 48,000 students	_____	

5. How many times have you personally contacted (telephone, letters, personal visits, etc.) a member of the Division of Instructional Media regarding ESEA IV-B during the past year?

_____times

6. How many times have members of the Division of Instructional Media-ESEA IV-B, personally been in contact with you during the past year?

_____times

7. When you call the Division of Instructional Media - ESEA IV-B, how often do you call. . .

a.	to ask for information about ESEA IV-B fiscal matters?	____times
b.	to ask for assistance in preparation of your ESEA IV-B proposal?	_____times
c.	to clarify questions regarding the proposal application?	_____times
d.	to ask for information about the ESEA IV-B program monitoring process?	_____times

8. When you call the Division of Instructional Media - ESEA IV-B, about how many minutes do you usually spend on the telephone?

_____minutes

9. During the past two years, the Administrative Coordinator of Federal Projects for the Division of Instructional Media visited the person responsible for financial records of your ESEA IV-B project. Please contact your financial records person and ask if the visit was . . .

Extremely helpful _____ Somewhat helpful _____ Helpful _____
Slightly helpful _____ Not helpful _____

10. In general, how important or worthwhile are the Division of Instructional Media - ESEA IV-B services you use?

Extremely helpful _____ Somewhat important _____ Important _____
Slightly helpful _____ Not very important _____

11. Your school corporation has received ESEA IV-B funds on the basis of?

	1976	1977	1978	1979
a. Enrollment	____	____	____	____
b. High Cost Pupils (compensatory, sparsity, institutionalized)	____	____	____	____
c. High Tax Rate/Below Average Expenditure	____	____	____	____

12. How satisfied are you with the. . .

(NOTE: Please circle your response)

	Extremely Unsatisfied				Extremely Satisfied	Not Applicable
a. information about ESEA IV-B provided by the Division of Instructional Media?	1	2	3	4	5	
b. formula based on the criteria established by the federal law PL93-380 by which funds are allocated to your school corporation?	1	2	3	4	5	
c. efficiency the Division handles your ESEA IV-B's finances?	1	2	3	4	5	
d. Administrative Manual and Guidelines provided by the Division?	1	2	3	4	5	
e. current information requested on the fiscal 1980 application form?	1	2	3	4	5	NA
f. with on-site monitoring conducted by a program consultant from the Division?	1	2	3	4	5	NA
g. follow-up letters forwarded by the program consultant after the on-site monitoring?	1	2	3	4	5	NA
h. regional ESEA IV-B workshops sponsored by the Division?	1	2	3	4	5	NA
i. efficiency of the Division at approving ESEA IV-B applications?	1	2	3	4	5	

12. (continued)

	Extremely Unsatisfied				Extremely Satisfied	Not Applicable
j. dates designated when applications are due?	1	2	3	4	5	
k. non-public school coordination responsibility which is required by ESEA IV-B rules and regulations?	1	2	3	4	5	NA
l. assistance provided by the program consultant from the Division?	1	2	3	4	5	

13. How can the Division of Instructional Media improve on administering the ESEA IV-B Program?

APPENDIX III

State of INDIANA

Department of Public Instruction
Harold H. Negley, Superintendent
Room 229, State House • Indianapolis 46204
317/633-5640

Division of Instructional Media — ESEA Title IV-B
Room 229, State House
317/927-0296

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Principals
Private, Non-Profit Schools

FROM: Phyllis Land, Director
Division of Instructional Media and ESEA IV-B

Because your school has participated in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title IV-B, we are asking your help. Our office, in an attempt to improve the administration of the program, has contracted with Dr. John Ellison, State University of New York at Buffalo, to conduct a comprehensive evaluation. You can help us by responding promptly to the attached questionnaire.

We believe that Indiana is the first state to seek this kind of evaluative information from non-public schools. Your cooperation is important to the future directions of the administration of this program.

I will appreciate your help in this activity and look forward to working with you in the future.

PL/u

Enc.

Office Location: 3833 N. Meridian St., Indianapolis

State University of New York at Buffalo

SCHOOL OF INFORMATION AND LIBRARY STUDIES

Indiana Non-Public School Survey
December 7, 1979

Dear Principal:

The purpose of this study is to determine the quality of service provided by the Division of Instructional Media - ESEA IV-B, Indiana Department of Public Instruction as viewed by YOU. Responses obtained from each school will be treated as confidential and individual identity is not solicited and will not be recorded. Total anonymity is guaranteed. The data obtained will be used in a highly professional manner to further the causes of education, and with the idea in mind of assisting your school.

YOUR PERSONAL FEELINGS AS THEY RELATE TO THE TIME YOU HAVE PARTICIPATED IN THE ESEA IV-B PROGRAM IS THE ONLY CONCERN OF THIS STUDY UNLESS OTHERWISE INDICATED IN A SPECIFIC QUESTION. Please take a few minutes to record your personal feelings and return the survey by January 11, 1980. Follow-up letters will not be mailed to solicit responses not received after January 11, 1980.

Again, this survey is not intended to evaluate any division, department or activity other than the Division of Instructional Media - ESEA IV-B. Your cooperation is most sincerely appreciated.

Cordially,

John W. Ellison
Associate Professor

/rm
Enc.

LAWRENCE D. BELL HALL BUFFALO, NEW YORK 14260 TEL. (716) 636-2412

1. What is your position?

   Superintendent ___
   Assistant Superintendent ___
   Principal ___
   Librarian ___
   Federal Project Director ___
   Other _____

2. How many years have you personally administered the ESEA IV-B Program?

   _____ years

3. Approximately how far is your school from Indianapolis?

   0-50 miles _____
   51-100 miles _____
   101-150 miles _____ (check one)
   151-200 miles _____
   201-250 miles _____

4. How many students are currently enrolled in your non-public school?

   0-500 students _____
   501-1,500 students _____ (check one)
   1,501-3,000 students _____
   Above 3,000 students _____

5. How many times have you personally contacted (telephone, letters, personal visits etc.) a member of the staff of the Division of Instructional Media regarding ESEA IV-B during the past year?

   _____times

6. How many times have members of the Division of Instructional Media - ESEA IV-B personally been in contact (telephone, letters, personal visits, ect.) with you during the past year?

   _____ times

7. When you call the Division of Instructional Media - ESEA IV-B, how often do you call . . .

   a. to ask for information about ESEA IV-B fiscal matters? _____ times
   b. to ask for assistance in preparation of your ESEA IV-B proposal? _____ times
   c. to clarify questions regarding the proposal application? _____ times
   d. to ask for information about the ESEA IV-B program monitoring process? _____ times

8. When you call the Division of Instructional Media - ESEA IV-B, about how many minutes do you usually spend on the telephone?

   _____minutes

9. In general, how important or worthwhile to you are the Division of Instructional Media - ESEA IV-B, services you use?

   Extremely important _____ Somewhat important _____ Important _____
   Slightly important _____ Not very important _____

10. How satisfied are you with the . . .

(NOTE: Please circle your response)

	Extremely Unsatisfied				Extremely Satisfied	Not Applicable
a. information about ESEA IV-B provided by the Division of Instructional Media?	1	2	3	4	5	
b. basis for distribution of monies to your school?	1	2	3	4	5	
c. Administrative Manual and Guidelines provided by the Division?	1	2	3	4	5	
d. technical assistance provided by the program consultants from the Division?	1	2	3	4	5	NA
e. with on-site monitoring conducted by a program consultant from the Division?	1	2	3	4	5	NA
f. regional ESEA IV-B workshops sponsored by the Division?	1	2	3	4	5	NA
g. coordination between your school and the public school corporation?	1	2	3	4	5	
h. dates designated when applications are due?	1	2	3	4	5	
i. current information requested on the fiscal 1980 application form?	1	2	3	4	5	

11. How can the Division of Instructional Media improve on administering the ESEA IV-B program?

APPENDIX IV

The following are comments public school respondents submitted to the question, "How can the Division of Instructional Media improve on administering the ESEA IV-B Program?" All references to individual names and specific schools have been removed. Comments were typed as they were written.

1. Work to adjust formula/allocation of funds.

2. We need more information about the basis of our funds as asked in question #11.

3. The first several years I was contact person, I contacted the Division of Instructional Media often, attended workshops and etc. I would say they probably have one of the best run divisions in D.P.I. Unless they just want to give us the money with no strings, I can't think of a better method than the one presently in use.

4. I would like to see a completed (sample application) as part of the Administration maunal. Each time I have contacted the Division of Instructional Media, the people have been extremely courteous and helpful and have fully answered my questions.

5. I'm really quite satisfied if the way Title IVB is administered. Our 1980 application was processed approved and returned in five days. This speaks well of the State organization.

6. It is unfortunate that all title programs are not run as effective with as much freedom to help the instructional problems at each individual school as Title IVB and its administration for the State of Indiana. I would like to see all Federal & State moneys administered through such a program. Title IVB does more to aid our programs than any other (although there is much less funds) because it allows for flexibility to use the funds whereit can do the most good.

7. Less paperwork

8. The personnel that I contact have been accomplishing the task in a very expedient way. They do suggest ways our project can be improved which is of great benefit. Presently I can think of no way to improve the program at this point in time.

9. Doing a very good job now.

10. I believe it would be helpful if the Guidelines defined even more clearly what types of materials can and can not be purchased with Title IV-B funds, and if materials are purchased for use in the classroom, what type of recordkeeping should be maintained by the librarian or whoever keeps the records.

11. My first & primary request is for a single application from the school district, rather than including one from each individual school.

12. I have been very satisfied with the administration of the program at the state level to date. Any question I ever had was answered quickly and effeciently.

13. I feel you are doing a most efficient job.

14. I feel they do a very fine job.

15. I believe they are doing a fine job!

16. Provide more frequent programming meetings for program writers (contact people). Provide examples of programs that are illustrative.

17. I frankly have been please with Title IV B except I disagree with the way funds are allocated. I see no connection between sparsity of population and the need for materials and equipment which can be purchased under Title IV B. Of the three schools corp. in this county we are the largest yet the other corporations receive 2 or 3 times as much money under Title IV B as we receive. One of the corporations has a higher valuation per pupil than we have, yet they receive twice as much money as we receive. I think the formula should be based on enrollment.

18. has done an admirable job of administering the Indiana ESEA IV-B program. I would like to see some of the funds set aside for competitive grants up to $25000 each. The way the materials and equipment are used leaves few ways to evaluate effectiveness. There is no way to evaluate the worth of a book to a class or school or to definitively state that the use of such made any difference.(sic) I don't know the answer but there should be ways to determine whether the hardware and software truly do make a difference. The person in ' Office, , has always been helpful to me as well as .

19. We are very pleased with the Division of Instructional Media!

20. In view of federal regulations and their timing I suspect they are doing all they can.

21. Items 11 & 12b are not clearly understood by me. I am not blaming anyone - certainly I should read the law and then ask consultants for any clarification.

22. We are very satisfied with the Division of Instructional Media Dept. We have had excellent service from the Division.

23. Is working satisfactory

24. At the present I see no needs for improving by to continue "yes!" (sic)

25. Program well run. People in central office very helpful.

26. Tell them to keep up the good work. Attemp to get increased funding. (sic)

27. O.K. continue as is.

28. Continued efforts to keep application forms & related administrative services as simple as possible will be appreciated.

29. Very efficient service.

30. I have never received information regarding the distribution formula. Knowledge of this might help to moderate the fluctuation of available movies from Title IV-B.

31. All Federal Projects COULD BE IMPROVED BY ELIMINATING VOLUMINOUS PAPER-WORK (i.e. Wasted MONIES)! Because there is so much JUNK MAIL, you may not receive some surveys that you mailed! This survey was almost discared because there is no envelope "LOGO" connecting it to INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION! Good Luck

32. The ESEA IV-B program is the easiest of all to handle at local level. There is less delay, less red tape, and less "MICKEY MOUSE" in the Title IVB program than in any of the rest. Please don't louse it up!

33. Thus far I've had no real problems. They've responded to my requests.

34. There still appears to be a great deal of confusion as to what the money can be used for. Clearer, more definitive statements might help.

35. Keep applications short and simple!

36. We are very satisfied with DPI's involvement and appreciate the opportunity to pursue special programs such as these with a minimum of paperwork and hassle. Everyone has been very helpful at the Division of Instructional Media, especially when we had local problems. The Sept. 30 final is bad. If there were problems over the summer there isn't enough time with opening school pressures to correct them.

37. I think they do an excellent job! (Particular in the past few years.)

38. You're okay!

39. I think our state title IV-B staff is doing an excellent job. Thanks

40. Improve the formula so that it will increase the amount of money available for our students' instructional needs.

41. In our case we annually contact the small non-public school and they deny use of the funds. If we could contact them once and have them contact us for future use, would eliminate some worthless contacts. We have been very well satisfied with the operation of Title IV-B - Too bad Title I can't take some lessons.

42. Compile a list of previously successful IV B projects - ideas are precious; and should be shared. install an 800 telephone #

43. Compared with other federal programs I rate this program near the top. This rating is based on the fact that I believe that the monies are made available for worthwhile purposes, and relatively little "red tape" is necessary to secure approval for or to administer the program.

44. I personally feel the program is operating quite successfully. The Div. of Instructional Media does an excellent job and are to be commended.

45. The most important person for the schools is the Div. of Instructional Media program consultant assigned to your district. If you have a good program consultant, Title IV-B goes along easily.

46. It's working satisfactorily for us, at the present time.

47. It should be considered that the burden of justifying expenditures for non-public schools be placed on the non-public school personnel. The regulations require that funds be made available on an equitable basis and justified by the school agency in charge. I recommend that the state should determine what is fare and equal for private school involvement and not require the persons applying for an application approval be required to write a narrative justifying equitable involvement. To judge what is fare and equal is very difficulty for the host school.

48. We have, to date, been well satisfied!

49. I feel they are doing a great job!

50. Stop using money for their own "pet" projects and place it where schools can use it. There have been some workshops calling for the handling media specialist and the building principal along with a board member held during standard vacation time in August that would appear to be of greatest importance to the workshop leader - so she can be paid and the money spent. The main competency of the workshop leader: her friendship with the state director.

51. The funding formula should be more equitable and the schools need a rough idea how much to expect. School administrators do take IV-B funding into account as they prepare bugets. If the funding formula changes, the pinch is felt at the building level.

52. Application length & detail are much better than most federal forms.

53. Being a conservative individual, I wonder if a closer check on the true needs for equipment might be devised. It appears that some rather expensive material is sometimes purchased on the whims of irrational thinking.

54. Offer more assistance to building personell concerning writing programs and innovative ideas for programs.

55. (We appreciate the shorter forms to fill out.) The money has certainly increased our audio-visual materials.

56. This program's administration has been outstanding, highly professional, and sincerely appreciated. Suggest no changes in so far as this corporation is concerned.

57. Continual communications-

58. We feel that the Indiana Division of Instructional Media has done an excellent job of administering the ESEA Title IV-B Program. We have no suggestions for improvement.

59. This being only my second year to work as the director of Title IV-B for the Corporation, I don't feel I have an adequate amount of knowledge to suggest any administrative changes at this time.

60. This incidently does not apply to us.
School is a joint vocational school. We may need to get acquainted.

61. They do a good job.

62. Help by providing funds earlier in the year so teachers can have materials available sooner. So many times we make out the application in October or November and the funds are not available until in January. By the time they are purchased it is late in the spring or near the end of the school year.

63. I'm satisfied.

64. They have been of help at all times, when ever asked.

65. I am very well pleased with the program as it is now being administrated.

66. This is the easiest federal program to administer, and the funds have been enormously beneficial. The SEA staff has been cordial (always) and responses to inquiries have been precise which I appreciate. The response to 12-g occurs because I do not believe a report has been received.

67. Be more specific about the evaluation procedure required for each project. When IV-B people come in they want to see inventories or financial data but seem to be of no concern how each project went.

68. The Instructional Media people are doing a good job. We have been satisfied with thier service.

69. Of the federal programs I administer, Title IV-B is the simplest, most straight forward program I have known. The IV-B people have worked to keep their paperwork to a minimum. I highly appreciate

that. Their guidelines are simple and clear. They give firm answers when I ask questions. Title I and other federal programs would do well to follow the fine example set by IV-B.

70. Eliminate writing proposals - objectives - evaluation.

71. Manage to get the Watts Line time more (I would prefer to call and ask to have the call returned. Often I am told the line is not available.) I think Title IVB, formerly ESEA II, has done the best job of using federal funds as they were intended. I think the media specialists/librarians have done a fine job of putting students' first. I would prefer more definition and publicity so that we do not have to keep fighting at the local level for these funds. I also think 1 C funds should to to 4-B! 4-C is too fractured and this would get those funds used on local level they were intended for.
Our contact person- Don Woolls - never loses patience, is quite with an answer and follows up any request. I consider this division the best of DPT!!

72. Program Satisfactory

73. Let non-public take care of their own.

74. No suggestions except forms required should be up-to-date.

75. Current format is probably as concise and brief as possible. We have become accustomed to working with a set of goals.

76. Overall and in comparison with other federal projects, ESEA IV-B is a pleasure. The application is much easier and there is enough flexibility in spending that the dollars received through the grant can be directed toward the improvement of the instructional program.

77. I am pleased with finanical end and have told state agency so in recent letter. They are the easiest people to work with of all our grants - from my viewpoint.

78. The Division of Instructional Media is doing an excelant job of administering the ESEA IV-B Program in Indiana. (sic) The whole program is easily understandable, the applicant is easy to handle and not bogged down with a lot of unnecessary "red tape". The ESES-IV-B Program in Indiana is being administered very well and should not be changed.

79. We have no complaints. We get better service with no hassle than we do from any other title program.

80. With the limited amounts of funds, this project is not that difficult to handle. I appreciate the unnecessary items in the application that have been eliminated. The budget presents some problems for use - I wish they would use budget years - Jan - Jan. - Not June to June.

81. Consideration should be given to eliminating maintinance of effect concept.

82. Considering all aspects of federal programs the Title IV-B program in this State is the most efficiently run program that out corporation participantes in. has done an excelent job directing this program.

83. The problems encountered in administering the TITLE IVB programs are and have always been minimal. There appears to be more emphasis on LEA personal options which allows sufficient opportunity to care for local needs. We feel the assistance has been of great value in updating our various media centers for the benefit of pupils/students and staff. Our corporation is supportive of the administration of TITLE IVB funds.

84. Doing a very fine job. We wish hot lunch programs & some other would take a lesson on efficiency from IVB.

85. By eliminating questions on the forms that no one checks - some ask for statements that concern idealist mattering.

86. Funding formula should provide more money for special or smaller programs. Our enrollment, of special education children does not allow the funds needed to operate a meaningful program; even though our needs remain the same as larger schools.

87. Keep up the good work!

88. We have had excellent rapport between our LEA and the Title IV-B staff of the Department of Public Instruction. As a senior participant in this program, it would be our general evaluation, that there has been progressive improvement since the department has been under the supervision of Ms. , director. Thank you.

89. You're been great!

90. Leave it as is -

91. I feel the program is functioning satisfactory in our School Corp. We in general have no complaints.

92. An annual summary of some of the outstanding programs throughout the state would be advantageous. Some of the better ones might be adapted for other school corporations. This would be one means of eliminating the time it takes to complete the application, especially where the adapted programs are replications.

93. One of the biggest helps you can offer would be to work for a change in the law to do away with the program aspect of the projects. The old Title II format of purchasing needed media materials was better suited to the large corporations that receive large amounts of money, but for the smaller corporation receiving less than $5,000 it becomes almost more work than it's worth to monitor the projects.

94. The 3-year option was very helpful. Some of the narrative on needs of students (how $ will help) seems unnecessary. I appreciate the "leeway" we have on spending & think it should be continued & furthered.

95. Perhaps by making the allocation available earlier so that project can be developed, approved, and materials ordered earlier in the year to get better and longer use of them.

96. I have found the directions (manual/guidelines) very well organized. As a consequence, frequent contacts have not been necessary. Some of the data on the report forms could be removed.

97. Receiving the Administrative Guidelines at the same time as the program forms and allocations would be very helpful.

98. We have found the Administrative Manual and Guidelines to be explicit, clear and complete. The personnel are always courteous and answer any questions adequately.

99. No significant suggestions.

100. I am satisfied with the present administration of the Title IV-B Program.

101. I do not see a way to improve the system. The personnel in the Division are extremely helpful.

102. There should not be as much paperwork involved.

103. We are very satisfied as is.

104. We have received excellent service, and we have no complaints.

105. In my opinion Title IV B is one of the best administered title program in the school. We only wish we could get more money but realize reasons why.

106. Continue keeping us informed.

107. We are very satisfied.

108. Less paper work! Many evaluation methods hard to put into use.

109. Clarify funding amounts for future allocations so realistic planning can take place. Our allocations this year were reduced 50% without any clarification. We always try to find out what the future of funding will be and something happened.

110. Just keep up the good work and the same quality of staff. I feel they are all personal friends wanting to help our needy schools -- some of the poorest in the state. The quality of our educaticnal program would be very low were it not for this excellent staff -- and Title IV-B monies.

111. I have had few application problems but the Division of Instructional Media has always responded very well. My biggest complaints would be with the monitor visitation about two years ago and I was disatisfied with the half hearted interest shown by the consultant - but that was the individual not the division - and she is no longer employed by the division. Our allocation has flucuated a good deal in the last three years and the explanation hasn't been satisfactory. I feel a corporation should realize an advantage when a great deal of local effort has been displayed and not based on enrollment and high tax base as it is now. Our Division of Instructional Media in Indiana are in general always courteous and helpful when called upon.

APPENDIX V

The following are comments non-public school respondents submitted to the question, "How can the Division of Instructional Media improve on administering the ESEA IV-B Program? All references to individual names and specific schools have been removed. Comments were typed as they were written.

1. I am returning this questionnaire unanswered, not because I did not want to take part in the evaluation process, but because I have just come to Indiana and do not feel that I can adequately answer the questions. My one observation, however, is that the application for Title IV-B funds as presented in Indiana is much less complicated than in other states I have worked. I appreciate this. Also, I did receive unsolicited aide from the local school system. That, too, was appreciated.

2. The amount of staff time spent to obtain a $500.00 grant was unacceptable.

3. If within their control, providing more time between notification of monies and deadline for forms. This difficulty might stem from the LEA here in informing our superintendent. Thank you for the opportunity to complete this questionnaire.

4. Our media specialist is very cooperative and willing to help us in any way. Mr. has offered his assistance at any time we have asked and we are pleased with the ESEA IV-B program.

5. I use the local public school co-ordinator as a resource person rather than the Division of Instructional Media. Perhaps if he (local person) was not so helpful, then I would call the State agency.

6. Since this is my first experience with dealing in ESEA IV-B matters, I feel I am not knowledgeable enough to comment.

7. Quite satisfied the way it's administered now. Thanks.

8. Give more time for making decisions as to what is to be purchased. Do not specify the amount to be spent for each category.

9. 1. Explain the basis of allocations. (Each private school rec'd same $, though enrollments were different) 2. Allow more time for planning & writing narrative of objectives, enabling steps, etc. so we have more time to plan orders. 3. Provide us with selection sources - ie not only Baker & Taylor, but other sources that we could select from. 4. Allow us to purchase books we need in a basic selection even though the copyright is not as recent as two years back. 5. Give us examples of accepted projects so we can learn from what others have done and make better use of our funding $'s. 6. Explain the possibility of the parochial schools of using the money as a unit. Perhaps instead of books & equipment, our amount could be used for the salary of a tutor who could work in all the schools on a schedule, and who could help children with perceptual problems so they could keep up with their classmates.

10. I feel that this has been one of the most valued services to non-public schools. I hope that present effort will be maintained!

11. We have never participated in any Title IV-B funds; therefore, I am returning this questionnaire without responses.

12. As indicated, I am extremely unsatisfied with the cooperation with the public school system. I understand that they know in October how much money we will receive. However, we are not told until March about the amount. We then must get our orders to them by June 1. I do not beleive this gives us much time to gather together our orders and type them up. Fortunately, I do have a "want file" so I am not rushed like other schools. Also, I was unable to use $300 of the money because the public schools did not reorder or notify the publisher to send the material when it was available. Again, I believe this was due to the lack of time.

13. Because of the great amount of paper work required for IV-B we have not been in the program for the past several years.

14. I am satisifed with the title IV program but since the schools work together through our superintendent I am totally unqualified in the area of answering these questions. Our superintendent does the phoning and takes care of the logistics of this program. Sorry I can't respond any more positively than this.

15. Dates for applications to be due should be established early and not changed.

16. Our Lutheran school superintendent, Mr. represents our interests in this area. He works with the local public school office in the area. I have little direct contact with the program.

17. Provide more time between the time the forms are sent and the deadline for completed forms.

18. Note: Our program is administered through the public school system. All materials & information are provided to us by them. This is an excellent arrangement.

19. At the present time, all the programs, our school is benefitting and participating with the public school system, have been to our advantage. They are providing us with excellent services.

20. I am very pleased with their endeavors. They are very helpful to non-public schools.

21. Make information available. We have never been contacted by them. Where are they hiding?

22. The information I receive is from local school Supt. Office at County. I was very pleased my first year here (last year) with the

allotment of $826.00. I was very disappointed with the first allotment given us of $337.00 this year. It seemed that something was wrong since we had heard that the amount should be at least $5.00 per child & we had 140 students. The Cath. Schools in the area mentioned it to Mr. (Supt.) Diocese & he contacted the authorities & we were given a fair show. This first allocation of $337.00 disturbed us because we need the correct amount to build up our schools & libraries too. We hope this will not happen again. There were a few items last year that were very slow in getting here. In fact the one set of filmstrips did not arrive until this year & we had our order in by mid Nov. 1978. Otherwise the teachers are very happy to receive additional educational aids & materials.

23. I personally feel some of the paperwork could be simplified. Otherwise, I have no specific complaints.

24. Good job!

25. We are grateful for financial assistance given.

26. Letter above is alright but many times the postmark of letters informing us of deadlines is within the week previous when public schools know much sooner. Administrators think of us AFTER all P.S. business is completed.

27. We need information sooner. However our area people are just super!!

28. We are a Nursery School & have not had any connection with this program except filling out yearly forms.

29. Redefine non-public status so that total non-public monies are available to those schools requesting grants - then recognition could be made of compensatory status and of quality proposals. If one are tied into our $450 per capita amount, IV B becomes far less significant to us and defeats teacher enthusiasm. extremely satisfied before state dept. redefinitions this year.

30. Again-I deal very little with State people, and almost solely with local public school persons. Perhaps State IM persons ought to let non public school officials know that they exist and are available for providing certain services. Generally, I am satisfied with our Title IV-B participation. NOTE: Since the eleven elementary parochial schools (Lutheran) in cooperate in the Title IV B program, I am filling out just one form for all eleven schools.

31. Go out of business and stop wasting tax money.

32. Our only contact concerning this program is with the LEA. We feel they are doing a fine job.

33. Send out the information the same time the public school system receive theirs. Also to have some say to the way we can use money.

It seems we get what is left in the planning session & have no say-so in setting up programs.

34. We are still waiting for over 1 year to receive some items.

35. Concerning the above, I checked 5 for b, g, and h, because up until this year our school has shared equally with the public schools, the funds received by Title IV-B--not only the per pupil allotment but also the additional monies based on taxes in the area. This year because of the funds stipulated for private schools, it was understood that we were to get only the per pupil amount. After some communications with the superintendent and someone in the Division of Instructional Media, we did get additional funds. I checked NA for the other areas because the local corporation does the paperwork and submits one form for all the schools involved. I do little other than the purchase orders. This set up is fantastic!! I do believe the private schools should be given an equal share of all the funds alotted to the public school corporation. If additional funds are given on a tax basis, then all students should share equally. At least our parents will benefit indirectly from some of the taxes they also pay.

36. I believe it is administered quite well as it is now, and I think the system has been vastly improved over the early years of the program.

37. 1. Poor diocesan communication 2. Treated as second rate citizens-our youngsters are not considered as important as public school children. We get left-overs from the public school.

38. It would be nice if applicants didn't have to "Prove" or "Support" all reasons. I know there has been abuse in the program and therefore I feel you are doing what is necessary. The students benefit from the materials received, so continue the good work.

39. I was in for 10 years - placed applications and generally received materials before end of year. seems to operate slower - the process (?) materials may not be in till next year. To receive in year (school) requested would be a greater psychologically booast to the teachers whose input - time tec. are used & requested.

40. Keep up the good work!

41. Less paperwork. In response to #5,7,8,9 Our contact has been with the librarian at Public School. She supervised the total ESEA IV-B Program for all of ,.public and private schools. The public school system in has been most cooperative and helpful in assisting us in any way that was needed. We are grateful;

42. More detailed background information.

43. Inform us sooner so as to have more time to prepare forms. Too much rush -- everything at the last minute.

44. All my contact has been with the local public school system. The amounts we received before were not all that great--about 900.00 This year, due to a prior arrangement, it will be about 9,000.00. But alot of this will go for "processing" or so we are told--almost a quarter of every dollar. When we questioned this we were told in essence that it could be more so we should be greatful just to be getting what we were. An attitude-it seems to be a me- to be a little overbearing & patronizing. Why should we be made to feel like we're hogging monies that actually belong to us. You have to wait for at least a year to even get the stuff. I really honestly believe that the local school corporation wishes we weren't getting the money - that we are a burden to them. *This is the first time in 4 years that we have been getting IV-B funds due to a prior arrangement. This may sound like some gripes on my part but when you feel mistreated what else can you feel? We are a good school with a fine professional staff. I find it very difficult to behave like an "Uncle Tom" to the big, all-powerful "massa" public school corporation! My suggestion would be separate administration of the movies. Cut out the bureacracy that way. Thanks for listening.

45. I feel that the arrangement with the Local Public School Corporation is adequate.

46. Clearer information on how to fill-out form, and information on workshops. The coordinator who toured the school in late October was very informative.

47. I can't really give any more feelings than this.

48. We need more communication. We never find out what's going on until the last minute or it's too late to do anything. It is entirely possible that the bog down comes from our own Central Diocesan Office. If that's the case then arrangements should be made to deal more directly with the schools or insist on accountability of the representative.

49. I am new in Indiana as of 8/79 but will be happy to cooperate in the future. Thank you.

50. Make sure we have enough time from when we are informed about what we may order and the dealine for our order. We are fortunate to get a 2 week notice.

51. Our school is completely financed by Church funds. In order to keep separated from State control the Board wishes to remain this way. Teaching personnel have their M.S. Degrees from Indiana State University and Life License.

52. Since this is my first year, I feel I have very little to offer at this time. They were very helpful this past summer.

53. In our particular circumstance we find the Division of Instructional Media very helpful, informative and in touch to giving us information and help in Title funds. I bel ve they do try to contact the private schools at least the ones who have been involved in the program to date in the title monies available. Perhaps they could make a check list to see that all private schools are notified of the title funds that are available. Otherwise, in our instance they have been very good.

54. I am grateful to be able to participate and share in this program. MSD of Township has been more than helpful and always inculdes us in any program that applies.

55. 1. It always helps to have more time.
2. forms are reasonable?
3. How does the state allocate unused non-public monies?
4. How does D.P.I. evaluate current fiscal information requested?

56. I have been in 3 different areas of the state and I must say this is one of the most efficient places concerning IV-B program. Really do want to thank you for all of your help and concern.

57. I regret that I cannot answer the questions more completely. I've been principal only since August. My only contact with Title IV has been through checking in the materials that were ordered by my predecessor.

58. We have a wonderful relationship with who is in charge of ESEA IV-B. She calls us in for personal interviews and answers all the questions I might have.

59. Learn about other funded programs which are successful.

60. We are satisfied! Our relationship with the public school administrative office here is good. There is mutual respect for all.

61. re a. & b. above - who decides how much money is allocated to each school? Why are allocations cut in about half sometimes while surrounding counties receive more than the year before?
re: h. sometimes notices are too short to be able to five the faculty time to make requests & fill in lengthly, detailed questionnaires. Time span seems very long between request deadline and receiving the material. Sometimes the teachers who reqaest the materials are not here when it arrives the next year. Thank you.

62. By arriving at a simple method of applying for the materials.

63. I'm not sure - we have an excellent local public school system - they have always been most helpful-they are our direct contact for any & all questions.

64. I find the letters of communication too technical for easy understanding.

65. By getting me basic information about the program I am a new principal and need much education.

66. 1. Administer more money to us - we save the taxpayers so much money, we deserve a greater share than we are getting. 2. Catholic schools do not have the administrative force the public schools have. Why do we have to apply as an individual school? Why can't we apply for IV-B grants as a system? The reasons we are given locally are limp; who makes these decisions. We need more input. I've been principal in Catholic schools in , , and Indianapolis. The help we got in was outstanding, was good, is insulting and not very generous.

67. When I have any questions about Title IV-B, I usually call Mr. from the Community Schools - He has always been most helpful-keep up all your good work!

68. Satisfied

69. Distribute unused monies to those schools which do apply for the funds.

70. I didn't know DIM did anything - we always work through our LEA- County and are satisifed with their help, explanations, etc. Too many strings attached-sometimes one would just like to upgrade the selection of materials.

71. The monies not used by non-public schools should be distributed to those non-public schools who participate in the program.

72. We are entirely satisfied with ESEA IV-B. The administration of our local Community Schools has cooperated with us one hundred percent. We are happy with the way ESEA IV-B is being handled.

73. The administration of the Title IV-B program has been well done through the local school district. They have cooperated well in giving proper information and allocations have been well proportioned to area schools.

74. We participated some years ago (before my time) we have not participated in this program for 6 or 7 years at least.

75. Most of our work is just done with cooperation of the public

school system. I attended one workshop but it was unsatisfactory-as no one else from the system was there and the public school system controls the strings, we just go along with them.

76. I feel that some of the book work - filling in detailed forms is a bit lengthy and do not feel that it is that important. I also feel that the maintenance of effort report is unrealistic in that more money may be available to the local non-public school one year vary from another year. One does not necessarily have the money for or actually need more items in the area of hardware than the previous year. I would like to see some provision made for this on future reports. Thank you for your interest in our opinions. I personally appreciate the aide we do receive and hope that more aide might be available to us in years to come. I feel that we have an excellent program and contribute much to the education of our youth.

77. Cut down clerical staff, if possible. and apply amount of money to student allocation.

78. Work to keep ESEA IV-B Program.

79. Note: In past years our school has only used the program through our local public school. Our funds have been sent directly to them in exchange for usage of all media materials.

80. I personally would like to have the monies allocated according to need rather than enrollment. Thank you.

81. Our school is a non profit organization for 4 year olds. We do not use any of the above services.

82. I really don't think this form applies to us. We know the sum of money we can get but the Central office processes the forms.

83. Our county is satisfied.

84. Most of my contact with Division of Instructional Media is thru the media staff at Community schools. They are most helpful in answering my questions. I wish I got an accouting of our allocation. I never have. I find the instructions sent by the Division of Instructional Media practically incomprehensible-full of educational "buzz" words. In other words they are not written in clear, standard English.

85. We are quite happy with the administration of the program. With all forms, questions, and monitoring done with and/or why the local public school corporation; all work and/or problems have been easily dealt with. Thank you for your concern.

86. All coordination of Title IV-B programs has been through Mrs. of the School District. She has been extremely helpful. We have had very little contact with the State Division.

87. Is there an amount specified per pupil? We have at least 20 more students but the amount is about the same as last year. What about the money our school was deprived in 1975-77? Who got these funds.

88. Mrs. has been most helpful in every way. I do feel that there is too much bureaucracy at the state level.

89. Most of this was done on a local level.

90. I am satisfied with them in my particular setting, feeling they do an adequate job and service to our Schools. Many thanks.

91. We are very fortunate in Indianapolis to have a consultant, , who has done an excellent job in including non-public schools and in aiding them in applying for the grants. I would suggest that Title I non-public schools be given additional monies like Title I public schools. Head count for monies doesn't seem fair for people serving in the inner city in extreme low social economic areas.

92. Township administrators are great. No problem, no suggestion for improvement.

93. I am pleased with the Title IV-B program, because it provides our school with more Library books and other needed media. Thanks!

94. Our school, School, Blvd., , has not participated in Title IV B. We are a church related Nursery school with children aged 2-5 yrs. old and have not accepted any money.

95. Very well satisfied.

96. In my discussion with other non-public school principals I find that there is a great diversity in the distribution of monies from place to place.

97. The Administration Manual and Guidelines could be more specific in their explanations of eligible expenditures. Regional workshops would be helpful in further explaining possible means of disbursing funds. The basis for distribution should be explained and a formula, similar to the one used for the public schools, (e.g., Number of students and effort) should be initiated.

98. I began filling in the report and then decided it best to say my portion of the money was used at the media center of the Cath. School office.

99. Sorry, this survey return is late. The only improvement might be to allow more time between notification of deadline for applications and time for the preparation of the application.

100. Most of my contacts concerning the ESEA IV-B program have been with the Community Schools ESEA IV-B administrator.

102. I think they are doing a good job.

103. As a Catholic High School librarian, I experience justice, kindness, cooperation and professionalism in the administration of this program. Title IV B program, according to my judgment, is professionally administered in Township, County, Indiana schools.
N.B. This questionnaire was received February 4, 1980.